

school, and they now have just successfully completed a \$2.5 million capital drive to add on to their facilities and improve them.

Our church started that. We did have and still largely do have religious restrictions on the hiring of individuals, but the facility serves all people in that community. It has brought in medical care workers of all faiths to work and provide medical care and dental care for the recipients in that community.

We started a housing program which turned into the Inner City Christian Federation, and we spun off this organization as well as Baxter Community Center, but they are still largely faith-based organizations. ICCF, the Inner City Christian Federation, developed housing programs, and they had built many houses before Habitat for Humanity started in our community; but ICCF has built and remodeled more houses than almost any organization within the city that I am aware of. Again, it is faith-based. The employees are hired partially on the basis of their faith and their commitment to serving in the inner city and often work for less pay than they could get elsewhere.

Our church, not our individual congregation, but our denomination started a mental health institution, Pine Rest, years ago because the people of our church and of our community were not getting adequate mental care. Today it is one of the largest mental health hospitals in our Nation. It serves many people of different faiths and of no faith, but it is a faith-based institution because their treatment modalities are based, to a large extent, on our beliefs about the nature of people and their interaction with each other. It has been very successful. It has received millions upon millions of dollars of aid from the Federal Government, from the State through community mental health funds and from the local community.

No one has ever said a word about this, that using Federal money for this is improper. The reason is simply that Pine Rest provides services that really are unequaled anywhere else. And so they have received Federal dollars through Medicaid and through Medicare, and State dollars through community mental health. It is an outstanding operation.

Then, finally, something we have ongoing in our church right now. Every Saturday, I wish you could visit our church; you would see people of all races, all colors, all faiths walking in the church basement which we have stocked with food that we have collected from different stores, warehouses and so forth: produce, baked goods, and many different types of perishable food.

We have purchased a truck to go around and collect this on Fridays. And Saturday morning anyone from that city can walk in with no test of their faith, no means test, they can just walk in and say, I need some gro-

ceries, and they go through the line. We charge them roughly 10 cents on the dollar because we think it is a good thing for them to feel they have bought something; but a family of four can buy a week's worth of groceries for about \$10. That is a good deal. It is staffed by people from our church and from other churches, and it is a very successful operation. If we adopt the Scott amendment, which we will be discussing later, we simply could not do that.

There is one other factor here as well, and that is every church that I am aware of does not have a surplus of money. The people that they hire have to do many different jobs. That is true in our church as well. We have hired individuals who work in the church. Those individuals not only operate programs such as the food program, or getting community centers started, but they also have duties within the church and by necessity, and clearly within the intent of the Civil Rights Act, they are performing religious duties. A church cannot go out and afford to hire a different person to run each different program. You have to be multifaceted to be on the staff of a church, and that is precisely what we have in our church.

For these reasons, and many others I could enumerate, I urge the Congress to pass this rule and this bill, and to defeat the Scott amendment, so that churches and faith-based organizations of other sorts can continue to do their good work for the people of this country without fear of their programs being damaged because they would have to hire additional personnel who do not have a faith compatible with the organization.

I believe the system as we have it now, and have had it since the 1964 Civil Rights Act, has worked, it has worked well, and I urge that we keep it that way and not adopt the Scott amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just say to the gentleman who just spoke that we believe that there are many religious organizations, many faith-based organizations that do incredible work, and they will still be able to do incredible work. What we object to, quite frankly, is the use of taxpayers' money to basically subsidize discrimination. It is not just a concern that those of us who are speaking here have; I submitted a list of close to 70 civil rights and religious organizations that have objections to this provision, including the African American Ministers in Action; American Jewish Committee; the American Jewish Congress; Americans for Religious Liberty; the Anti-Defamation League; the Baptist Joint Committee; Central Conference of American Rabbis; Episcopal Church, USA; the General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church; the National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd; National Council of Jewish

Women; NETWORK, a national Catholic social justice lobby; Presbyterian Church USA; Protestants For the Common Good; Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism; Texas Faith Network; the Interfaith Alliance; Union for Reform Judaism; United Universalist Association of Congregations; United Church of Christ Justice & Witness Ministries. They go on and on and on. This is a concern that many of the faith-based organizations all across this country share with us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about the amendment I will be offering. I will be offering it in conjunction with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) in order to preserve and maintain civil rights protections as they currently appear in the job training laws. Current law prohibits sponsors of job training programs from discriminating based on race or religion, and that policy goes back decades. For decades, our country has prohibited discrimination in hiring with Federal funds.

In 1941, President Roosevelt ordered a prohibition against discrimination in all defense contracts. In other words, since 1941, our national policy has been that even if you can build better and cheaper rifles, the Army will not buy them from you if you discriminate in employment. The Civil Rights Act passed in 1964, and it prohibited discrimination; but it included an exception for religious organizations, but that exception was limited to the context of the religious organizations using their own money. In 1965, President Johnson banned discrimination in all government contracts without exception.

□ 1445

In job training programs specifically, this Congress passed in 1982 the Job Training Partnership Act with bipartisan support. In that Act, Congress included a nondiscrimination clause without exception, and that remains the statutory requirement in job training requirement programs today. That policy will change and discrimination will be allowed if my amendment is not adopted.

So let us be clear. This is not a debate about religious organizations having the right to participate in job training programs. They already do. As the current law stands, and my amendment would keep that law intact, Catholic, Jewish, Lutheran, Baptist, and other religious organizations already get hundreds of millions dollars today to run job training and other federally funded programs. Religious organizations do not need Section 129 in the